DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 639 HE 002 189

TITLE	Student Manpower. Report of the Atlanta Student Manpower Project for the U.S. Department of Labor.
INSTITUTION	Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	1 Mar 70
NOTE	70p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*College Students, *Community Service Programs, Higher Education, *Internship Programs, *Manpower Utilization, Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	*Atlanta Student Manpower Project

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the Atlanta Student Manpower Project was to coordinate and report on a variety of efforts that utilized student manpower for community service to effectuate a large scale service-learning program. The major components of the project were: (1) the development and experience of the Atlanta Urban Corps through which 300 students carried out internships with community organizations during June through December 1969; (2) a survey identifying existing programs in colleges and universities that provide students with service experiences in community social and economic programs; (3) an exploration of student manpower utilization by federal agencies, private business, and other community agencies; (4) a student manpower survey of 1,670 students enrolled in Atlanta colleges; (5) the Atlanta Service-Learning Conference held June 30-July 1, 1969; and (6) the general internship experience of the Southern Regional Education Board. This report presents: (1) a summary of the conclusions; (2) some observations on student manpower; (3) a discussion of the projects; and (4) a list of recommendations. (AF)

EDO 536339

Student Manpower

REPORT OF THE ATLANTA STUDENT MANPOWER PROJECT

for the U.S. Department of Labor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

From Bay Tech
Clearinghouse for Community
Action Training & T/A Materials
1507 22 Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007

RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT INTERNSHIP PROJECT
SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD/U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

MANPOWER - STUDENT
F 810 124
HE 002 189
#810

S T U D E N T M A N P O W E R

REPORT OF THE ATLANTA STUDENT MANPOWER PROJECT

March 1, 1970

CONDUCTED UNDER A GRANT FROM THE

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

by

THE RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

OF THE SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD

130 Sixth Street, N.W. Atlanta, Georgia 30313

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS 5

III. OBSERVATIONS ON STUDENT MANPOWER 9

IV. THE ATLANTA STUDENT MANPOWER PROJECT 19

The Atlanta Urban Corps 20

Atlanta Area College Programs 26

Community Employment of Students 35

Student Manpower Survey 39

Atlanta Service Learning Conference 58

General SREB Experience 59

V. RECOMMENDATIONS 67

VI. APPENDIX 73

VII. BIBLIOGRAPHY 76

INTRODUCTION

As the decade of the 1970's begins, two of the most pressing domestic concerns have to do with the future of the cities and of higher education. This report deals primarily with the manpower aspects of a program that would integrate the resources and needs of cities and universities in a manner that would contribute to the objectives of each.

The program is not paternalistic. It does not refer only to the university's contributing of its resources to meet the problems of the city. Rather, the program is cooperative. It recognizes the needs of both the city and the university and the fact that each has resources that can serve the interests of the other.

The city needs competent manpower to help solve such problems as poor health, housing, inadequate education, and lack of communication between the people and city hall. The university needs an extension of campus to offer its students a relevant education--a chance to test their "book learning" against reality. It is always searching for new knowledge about the fabric of society.

The city's need for service and the university's need for learning gives the program a name, service-learning. The two words are linked together by a hyphen because each feeds the other; learning is enhanced through the experience of service, and the service given is enhanced when combined with disciplined reflection and sound academic principles.

For several years the service-learning concept has been at the heart of the Resource Development Internship Programs of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB). Here university students have undertaken projects with social and economic resource development agencies in the South. Each student or team of students has had a local project supervisor, an academic counselor, and a technical adviser. The student has been responsible for performing a task and for demonstrating what he has learned. Many students have received academic credit for their service-learning experiences.

Experience with the above program has shown it to be successful, not only in its service and learning dimensions, but also in forging constructive relationships between the university and the agency or community where the student served. Until 1969, the program had been small, with no more than 150 widely dispersed students participating at any one time.

In planning the 1969 program year, SREB experimented with the development of larger scale programs on community and state levels. The states of North Carolina and Georgia and the urban area of Atlanta were chosen as target areas.

Exploration in Atlanta revealed that a variety of efforts were under way which might be coordinated to effectuate a large scale service-learning program. The development of this program as a demonstration model offered an opportunity to experiment, to examine, and to report on the utilization of student manpower for community service in a major metropolitan area.

A grant from the U. S. Department of Labor made it possible to review the Atlanta experiment and to supplement it with additional information regarding the utilization and potential of student manpower in Atlanta. This report presents the results of the demonstration and related surveys and the opinions and recommendation arising from them.

The major components of the Atlanta Student Manpower Project were:

The development and experience of the Atlanta Urban Corps

A collection of information on college-based student-in-community programs

A sampling of 1,670 students enrolled in Atlanta colleges

An exploration of student manpower utilization by federal agencies, private business, and other community agencies

The deliberations of the Atlanta Service-Learning Conference

SREB's general internship experience

In carrying out the project, the service-learning idea has been put into practice. Students helped design surveys, conducted studies, prepared reports on components, and provided the major leadership in the Atlanta Urban Corps.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

The review and analysis of the Atlanta project and related information includes many implications for manpower policy at various levels. It also includes implications for educational policies and youth policies. The major conclusions are reported below and are supported in more detail in the main body of the report.

1. College students represent a large under-utilized source of manpower for community services.

The nation numbers 7,000,000 college students. Atlanta area colleges account for roughly 40,000. A large percentage of these appear to be ready, willing and able to contribute to the solution of community problems and the delivery of community services. Of the students surveyed in Atlanta, 81.5 percent indicated they would participate in a community service program under optimum conditions.

2. The number of students who work is relatively high but limited in levels of work and in relation to public service.

Survey experience indicates that more than 50 percent of students work part-time during school terms and full time during summers. Although the Atlanta survey, Urban Corps experience, and SREB experience show that many students would prefer public service assignments, the great majority who work sell their services to private business or work in jobs on campus.

3. The greatest factor in current student manpower availability and potential manpower utilization is money.

The need of most students to earn money is the single most important factor in their decisions for off-campus activity. This is not to say that students do not have commitments to serve, preferences or other concerns related to the use of their time and talents. Their need for money, however, is the most dominant factor found in the project. Very few students can afford to volunteer substantial portions of their time.

4. Traditional employment patterns may not be the best method of realizing the full potential of student manpower.

Very few students in summer employment outside the Atlanta Urban Corps reported that they fully utilized their previous education and training. The great majority reported no relationship between their work and their academic program.

5. No effective agencies for tapping student manpower resources for community service are found on campuses or in community organizations.

This lack was apparent in attempting to get information about student manpower utilization. It was also obvious in the response to the Urban Corps. With a late start and little publicity more than 800 applications from students for Urban Corps summer internships were received.

6. The coordination of service and learning has great potential in effectively utilizing student manpower and developing the professional manpower of the future.

Students reacted very favorably to the Atlanta Urban Corps internship arrangements which emphasized both service and learning. They accomplished a great deal, and their host community organizations have unanimously requested more interns. Also, the student survey showed the greatest interest in community service when combined with both financial support and educational recognition.

OBSERVATIONS ON STUDENT MANPOWER

OBSERVATIONS ON STUDENT MANPOWER

College student contributions to the manpower needs of society range from individual employment and volunteer services to large scale internships or other student involvement programs and field experience components of certain curricula. They include service through VISTA, the Peace Corps, and other programs at national, regional, state, local and institutional levels.

Most arrangements for the use of student manpower tend to serve limited purposes. They are designed to fill a job, to provide financial aid, to provide field experience, to satisfy a desire to serve, to meet a community need, or to recruit and train for a career. Most arrangements involve combinations of these functions, but few are deliberately constructed to realize the fullest potential for manpower needs, student development and education. Student manpower activities seem to fall in the following general categories.

A. Part-Time or Temporary Employment

According to the Atlanta sampling and observations, a majority of students engage in work for pay both part-time during academic terms and full time during vacation period. The greatest number work for private business in work unrelated to their academic programs. A large number work in clerical positions. Other major categories include sales, counseling or recreation, and administrative or professional-type work. A substantial number also perform general labor both on and off campus.

The major objective in these arrangements for the employer is the performance of a job, and for the student, the earning of money.

B. College-Based Field Experience Programs

Many variations of field experience programs are found. Most notable are the apprenticeship-type requirements of professional schools, e.g. practice teaching, medical internships, social work field assignments. In addition to the apprenticeships are research and observation assignments for courses requiring study of a "real life" model. Engineering co-ops and similar programs in other fields provide for a job experience segment of the educational programs. More recently interlude terms allowing a variety of individually structured experiences which may include off-campus assignments have appeared at a number of schools.

Financial rewards for student assignments of this nature are limited or nonexistent. In some cases the student pays for the experience. In some

programs students perform useful work for an agency; in others they carry out academic activities of little value beyond their own learning.

C. Community Service Programs

Ranging from the Peace Corps and VISTA to local programs organized around community needs, service programs are not exclusively for students. Red Cross volunteers, service programs of churches, YMCA, YWCA, community clubs, and other such activities often make special efforts to include students. Most of these provide only maintenance level or no compensation.

D. Student Volunteer Programs

Sometimes with and sometimes without college sponsorship or sanction student groups have organized volunteer activities relative to community needs. Some of these are simply means of feeding volunteers into community service programs. Others are unrelated to community organizations and entirely conceived and operated by students. Financial support for these programs is limited and in many cases the only finances come from student governments or individual student contributions.

E. Special Agency Intern Programs

Intern programs sponsored by special interest agencies are usually designed to attract students to specific careers or employment with the sponsoring agency. In some cases these programs have a more general interest in exposure or involvement in a particular field. Governor's or legislative internships, congressional interns, White House Fellows and management intern programs fall in this category. These are generally highly selective and usually carry remuneration. A relatively small number of students are involved.

F. Financial Aid Programs

The College Work-Study Program and similar smaller programs require employment as a condition of financial aid but are not operated as traditional employment programs. Similarly the commitment of federal agencies to employ disadvantaged youth is seen largely as a means of financial aid rather than a manpower utilization program. The Neighborhood Youth Corps also fits this category.

The above categories of arrangement for the use of student manpower are presented to indicate the scope of interest of this report. When student manpower is mentioned the hearer usually responds with only one of the above images in mind.

It is recognized that many programs do not fit cleanly in these categories. In fact, it is one of the conclusions of this project that while all of the above are useful, those programs which combine manpower needs, financial

needs, service motivation, educational growth and career explorations offer the greatest potential.

Advantages of Student Manpower

From observations of students in a variety of situations and discussions with students and their employers, certain special advantages of student manpower seem to appear sufficiently often to permit generalization. First, students represent a tremendous variety of types of manpower both in terms of personality and training. They are located in relatively accessible groupings throughout the country.

Student manpower is relatively inexpensive. While students need financial support, their demands for compensation relative to demands of professional personnel are very low. Financial goals of most students seem to be limited to sufficient funds to perform the kind of work they would like to perform, to have enough to live reasonably well while employed, and to pay the next year's tuition.

Related to the cost of student manpower is their short-term availability. This makes it possible for an agency to commit relatively few resources to the employment of the student compared to regular long-range employment. The student can come in for a short time, perform tasks to which he is assigned, and leave with no hard feelings or difficulties. Regular professional personnel are not generally available for such short-term assignments, and the employment of a regular worker implies a longer range commitment.

Students are extremely mobile; they are generally unencumbered by the family responsibilities, mortgages, etc. that they will have to meet in a few years. Accordingly, they are versatile in terms of location, hours of work, travel and other facets of mobility.

Since their appointment is usually for a limited time, students are free of some of the vested interests that accrue to professionals. They have no major loss of employment. They have no particular professional standing as yet and are free of the constraints of professionalism.

They generally represent no threat to other employees since they are not usually in a promotional line. Perhaps this accounts for the desire of almost everyone to help a student. Students appear to be able to move very freely within an organization and to deal effectively with people at all levels. One observation was made that students on short assignment serve as media for carrying information and ideas from one level to another and from one group to another in a way in which other means of communication could not.

The freshness and vigor of students is noted as a real asset by many. Students see things differently, partly because they are from another

generation and partly because they are unencumbered by the restraints of experience. Their questions, their observations and their suggestions are often found refreshing by their employers.

Another attribute of student manpower is its expendability. One supervisor indicated that he could use students to raise questions and to probe into areas which would be difficult for someone on the regular staff to do. Care was taken to keep the students from getting into difficulties; however, because of their freedom from long-range commitments to the organization, they were able to move into areas in which others would have difficulty--with the built-in defense that "they were just students."

Finally, an obvious advantage of student manpower is its potential for future recruitment. Many agencies deliberately involve students with little experience for productivity on the basis that the students provide a fertile source for future recruitment.

Limitations of Student Manpower

Most of the limitations of students in terms of manpower are rather obvious. Some of the attributes mentioned above are limitations when viewed from another perspective. A lack of experience limits the kind of assignments that students can carry out. The short-term nature of their availability is a limiting factor as well as a positive factor. In some situations the appointment of a student is seen as a burden on the organization requiring more input than return.

While the freshness and vigor of students is seen as an attribute, some of the attitudes of students are seen as a limitation. Some tend to be over-critical, loudly proclaiming what ought to be done and what is wrong, without making any contribution to the means by which improvements can be made. Students are often impatient with their own performance, in some cases rating their achievements lower than their supervisors would rate them.

These limitations indicate the importance of a special structure for student assignments to achieve most effective utilization of student manpower.

Student Attitudes toward Assignments in Community Service

It is impossible to generalize about students, particularly in regard to their attitudes and opinions; however, observations on the students directly involved in the Atlanta project may be indicative of some general concerns. Students working for community organizations, including private business, not under the Atlanta Urban Corps expressed relatively general satisfaction with their employment situation. Students appointed under the Urban Corps expressed opinions of their assignments ranging from total satisfaction to total alienation. The difference seems to be that of expectations.

Students accepting a job on the basis of their financial needs appear to be reasonably satisfied when they expect little more than this. However, students accepting assignments under a community service arrangement in a substantial number of cases appear to have expectations of what can be accomplished beyond that which they find possible. Individual interns with experience in community service situations indicated a much greater overall satisfaction with their internship experience compared to employment experiences in private business, experiences motivated solely by a need for funds. This may indicate special concerns for the use of students in public service. It emphasizes the need for consideration of the structure of an assignment.

Discussions with students indicate that, given a choice, they are more interested in performing a task than in holding a traditional job. Student leaders seem extremely concerned with the possibility of individual impact. They seem to assume that they will receive a reasonable salary and fringe benefits along with status and other job perquisites. Since these other concerns are assumed to be met, the issue for these students becomes, "Will people listen to my suggestions?"

Another attitude which seems to be held by a large number of students is that they will not be allowed to do anything innovative. Exploration of this with students indicates very little real basis for this assumption. It seems to be more a part of the conflict culture in which many students find themselves.

The students' interest in what they do rather than in what position they hold and in being assured of making an impact has great potential for achievement if students are put in positions where they can be creative and are given the guidance and support needed for the implementation of ideas. If not, disillusionment is confirmed and frustration is heightened, or a deadening submission can result.

Effective Utilization of Student Manpower in Public Service

Student manpower is not greatly used in public agencies in the Atlanta area, yet the possibilities of tasks that students can perform are apparently well beyond any immediate limits. Student interest and availability under optimum conditions is also apparently beyond such limits. The Urban Corps found many more requests for students than could be met on the basis of program financial and management capacity and also found more students available than could be placed.

One observation is that a distinction needs to be made between "manpower needs" and "positions open." It was often found with agencies that a limited number of positions were open at any particular time. However, in discussing tasks that need to be done and in which students could be used, no effective limit was found in terms of number, and no agency indicated that it was doing everything it would like to do. Much more use can be made of student

manpower by public agencies than is currently the case.

It is the observation of this project that most effective use of student manpower for public agencies can be accomplished under an arrangement which combines the agencies' needs for manpower, the students' need for financial support, the students' desire for community service and the educational possibilities of service. This is particularly important if the student is seen not only as a source of current manpower, but as a source of future manpower and citizenship which can be motivated and trained in the direction of the manpower and leadership needs of the community.

There are some special advantages to public agencies in using students in service-learning relationships. In general this means an affiliation with a college and an equal commitment to the student's learning as well as his labor. If the student has other requirements to satisfy than just providing his time and labor, he is apt to give a higher quality of performance than if he is simply satisfying a supervisor and a number of hours. He has a vested interest in the quality of his work.

Accordingly, a different set of standards can apply. The student brings a broader perspective to the job under a service-learning arrangement than under a traditional employment situation. He tends to be more objective and analytical in the situation in which he finds himself because he is required to look at it beyond the perspective of just putting in his time or carrying out his manpower function. Under such an arrangement the student becomes a means of bringing additional inputs to the agency. Faculty advice, library research and technical resources become part of the pattern.

Conversely, the service-learning arrangement can become a way for the practitioner to influence education. Many people outside the academic institutions wish they could have something to say about the way young people are being educated. The practitioner can influence not only a particular student but the educational program itself, through the student and his relationship with a college.

A service-learning setting produces a vitality which does not normally exist in a traditional employment situation. The student is questioning while he is doing. He is looking for meaning rather than just carrying out instructions. This can be frustrating or stimulating to his supervisor, but the potential for improvement is heightened.

This kind of arrangement also opens up a whole realm of possibilities of relationships with educational institutions. The student and his faculty adviser can become links between the institution and agency through which additional activities and mutual benefit can develop.

This service-learning approach has implications in general for traditional views of jobs and employment. These can be elevated from something a person has to do to make ends meet to an experience which combines

accomplishment with educational growth. The potential for learning experiences exists in most jobs but few employees realize it or have any assistance in fully exploiting it. These opportunities will increase during the coming years as more workers move off assembly line type tasks to those of human service. A pattern of deliberate educational growth coupled with a job has important implications for the requirements of constantly changing job demands. The integration of learning with doing should become a cornerstone of manpower policy.

T H E A T L A N T A S T U D E N T M A N P O W E R P R O J E C T

THE ATLANTA URBAN CORPS

ATLANTA AREA COLLEGE PROGRAMS

COMMUNITY EMPLOYMENT OF STUDENTS

STUDENT MANPOWER SURVEY

ATLANTA SERVICE-LEARNING CONFERENCE

GENERAL SREB EXPERIENCE

THE ATLANTA STUDENT MANPOWER PROJECT

Atlanta is a metropolitan area of about 1,300,000 population. It has a representative list of the urban problems, governmental agencies and community organizations that accompany the rapid rise of large urban concentrations. It also has a wide spectrum of educational institutions. Students enrolled in four-year colleges, graduate and professional schools in the area number over 40,000. This does not include enroilment in post-high school vocational education, technical schools or junior colleges. It was in relation to this complex of community needs, organizations, institutions and students that the Student Manpower Project took place.

The project was a collection of observations and studies of a variety of activities and factors rather than a controlled piece of research. Central to the project was the development of the Atlanta Urban Corps. Supplementing the Urban Corps experience were special studies of other means of student participation in meeting manpower needs in the community. One immediate result was the discovery that nowhere is there a comprehensive or even general picture of what students do outside the academic walls. This project is a long way from providing a complete profile of student manpower, but it does give some dimensions and descriptions of the use and potential of this source of energy and talent for community service.

The components of the project are described and the results reported in this section. Additional information is included in the reports of individual participants in the project. The Atlanta Urban Corps report "An Approach" is a primary source of additional information and is included as part of this report by reference.

The Atlanta Urban Corps

The significant facts of the Atlanta Urban Corps are that it now exists and that through its efforts almost 300 students carried out internships with community organizations during June - December 1969. The impetus of the 1969 program carries forward with expectations of larger numbers of service-learning arrangements in 1970. This is coupled with a movement toward greater integration of community needs and resources and the needs and resources of higher education.

The Atlanta Urban Corps is a direct outgrowth of student interest in community affairs and community manpower needs. With strong student leadership the Atlanta Urban Corps demonstrates the feasibility of integrating student interest and community needs in a constructive pattern.

The Urban Corps in the summer of 1969 was based in the Mayor's office of the City of Atlanta with support from SREB and other community agencies and with the cooperation of area colleges.

The following information summarizes the Summer 1969 program of the Atlanta Urban Corps:

Number of applications from students	800
Number actually placed	300
Number of interns who began work (based on declines, adjustments, and reassignments)	220
Number of job requests	350
Number of jobs selected	220
Number of city government departments participating	17
Number of other organizations participating	38
Internship dates	June 16-August 22
Number of College Work-Study Interns	114
Approximate racial percentages	white - 55% black - 45%
Number of interns in Urban Corps staff positions	15
Number of colleges represented by interns	43
Length of internship	(in weeks) 10
Budget for Summer (1969)	$210,000
Private Contributions	$ 41,000
Federal College Work-Study Program (CWSP) Funds	$ 78,000
City and Agency Funds	$ 91,000

The types of jobs the interns performed within the 55 participating agencies covered a wide range of tasks and required a wide range of intern skills and backgrounds. The jobs involved social work, teaching, technical and engineering skills, management, research, recreation, counseling, legal aid, day care projects, health programs and many other areas. Some examples of intern assignments and projects are:

A. City Government

1. Housing Resources Committee. The intern worked closely with the Housing Coordinator to keep up-to-date information on available low and medium income housing, its condition, location and suitability.

2. Mayor's Office. The interns assigned to the Mayor's office functioned out of the Community (EOA) Centers. They took complaints from the residents of the community, investigated them, routed them (along with possible solutions) to the department most able to solve the problem and finally followed up to see that the complaint was satisfied.

3. Sanitation Department. Interns assigned to this department conducted efficiency studies concerning various department operations. Others worked on a public opinion survey (of the division) and took steps to improve the image of the department.

4. City Attorney's Office. The intern, a law student, researched the points of law and the authority involved on several cases assigned by the office. The findings of her research were used in preparing briefs for these court cases.

5. Atlanta Youth Council. An intern in the Atlanta Youth Council performed functions for the Summer Youth Opportunity Program. This involved scheduling and announcement of events, organizing the "Funday" event and preparing the final report. This particular internship proved to be extremely successful in public relations.

6. Youth Walk-In Center. Three students assigned to the Youth Council operated a Youth Walk-In Center. This center eliminated the red tape of most counseling services and operated on the premise that it would provide any youth with whatever counseling and advice he needed, whenever he needed it. The Center had extensive publicity and was a success in its first year.

7. Parks and Recreation. The interns worked as "athletic coordinators" and assistants to district supervisors. They organized summer leagues in basketball, softball and other sports. They also organized special sports and hobby events and competitions.

Their efforts were directed toward citizens of all ages but most especially youth from 16 to 25.

8. Water Department. These interns performed research duties similar to the ones performed in the Sanitation Department. In addition two interns worked with the Quality Control Lab in study of water pollution.

B. Other Agencies

1. Street Theatre. This project was a joint effort of the Urban Corps and the Atlanta Public Library. It was established to be a thought-provoking vehicle presenting an issue or opinion to any audience and to stimulate discussion. Short, one-act plays were performed solely by Urban Corps interns on street corners, in playgrounds, in schools, recreation centers and churches. Audiences were mixed as to races, incomes and attitudes.

2. National Welfare Rights Organization (NWRO). One law student intern worked as an assistant to the Director of NWRO in Atlanta. His task was to organize the community, to inspire the residents to attend the meetings, to coordinate the meetings themselves and to distribute all new information concerning welfare rights to the residents. He also counseled recipients on their problems and misunderstandings concerning welfare.

3. Rent-A-Kid. Each of the Rent-A-Kid summer branch offices was managed by an intern whose task was to find part-time jobs for low-income youths. This service provided money for hundreds of young people. Besides running the offices, the interns provided some counseling services to the young Rent-A-Kid enrollees.

4. Literacy Action Foundation. Several interns offered a tutorial service through this agency. The students used innovative teaching methods in remedial teaching with classes and with individuals.

5. Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park. The interns operated an Environmental Studies program at the park. They conducted tours through the park mostly for inner-city children and youths, putting special emphasis on environmental study. The interns also prepared teaching methods and materials to be used in presenting the environmental studies in the public schools.

6. Grady Hospital Maternity and Infant Care Project (M&I). The intern in this project worked with postpartum patients. Her task was to encourage them to participate in the Grady Family Planning Clinic which was being established. She also did much work in the creation of the clinic itself.

7. Emory Legal Aid. The two interns in this agency were both law students. One was engaged in doing research for the staff attorneys on points of law and authority. Her work helped free the attorneys to spend more time with the clients. The other intern was allowed to practice law. He handled several welfare cases, paroles, assault cases and other legal problems. He also was involved in many cases challenging the rightfulness of some laws.

8. Health Fair Project. (EOA and Fulton County Health Department) The interns assisted in putting on Health Fairs in ten neighborhood areas. They organized the events to provide several basic medical tests free of charge, to dispense information about basic health practices, to assist residents in obtaining additional medical attention and generally to increase the community's awareness of the need for concern about health.

9. Decatur-DeKalb YMCA. A team of interns sponsored by the YMCA, organizationally on their own, established a day camp for educable mentally retarded children. They used several innovative teaching methods to obtain cooperation and involvement from the children.

10. Community Arts, Inc. This project employed several interns with artistic talent. The students taught various forms of art expression to children in the community. They also used this art project as a form of insight into the child's image of himself and his world. They organized and presented art shows of the work done by the children.

A series of seminars was held during the summer. There were three major seminars for all the interns and special seminars for selected interns. In addition, seven smaller, informal seminars were held in the evening at people's homes.

Each of the large seminars had a definite purpose and structure and incorporated presentation by community representatives of a major theme and then exploration by interns of the dimensions and meanings of the topic presented. This was accomplished by both large group and small group discussions. These seminars also provided an opportunity to discuss Urban Corps policy, to make important announcements and to pass out administrative information.

The seminars generally were well supported. Two of the three seminars were attended by the majority of the interns. However, the second, or middle, seminar suffered from a lack of planning, poor direction and unfavorable scheduling. The attendance at this meeting was low and unrepresentative.

The first seminar was incorporated into the first day of the Service-Learning Conference, held June 30, 1969. The intern seminar part of the conference presented two very articulate speakers who led the interns into meaningful discussion of Atlanta problems with particular reference to

minority community organization and legal services.

The second seminar was held in late July. The emphasis of this meeting was on the different approaches to social change. The gathering featured two prominent Atlantans, each working toward social reform. However, one operated within the "system," and the other from without. The presentations of these two individuals brought out many important questions on some of the methods used by each. However, the meeting had been improperly scheduled for an early Saturday morning and attendance was correspondingly low. The meeting was also managed poorly with the result that the interest and direction built up by the two speakers was lost by the time the discussion groups finally got started. In retrospect, this particular seminar can be viewed as the loss of a very good opportunity.

The third and final major seminar was held on August 15. High attendance and high interest was evident. The first session of the day was a panel of the five leading candidates for mayor (at that time - Cook, Massell, Jenness, Tate, Millican). Each candidate presented his ideas in a short talk and then the meeting developed into a lively question and answer session. The remainder of the day was spent in discussion groups which allowed the interns to comment on the future direction of the Urban Corps.

The small seminars were much less formal. They were held randomly by the Education-Evaluation staff in their homes. At these meetings certain groups were asked to come. The seminar was entirely devoted to discussion, with little leadership and few topical restrictions. A great deal was learned by the interns at these meetings, as well as a great deal being learned about them.

Special seminars for a group of interns particularly interested in the service-learning idea were held to discuss ways to improve and expand the program in Atlanta.

The interns' opinions of their summer experiences ran the gamut from total satisfaction to total alienation. Some of the reasons for this vast spread of opinion were:

1. Various students had different ideas of what the Urban Corps was when they began -- "just a job," "community service," "social revolution," "an educational experience," etc.

2. Some jobs were extremely rewarding. Job placement in other cases alienated the intern to the program. Interns in city government jobs generally expressed more frustrations than the non-city interns.

3. Another reason for the spread of opinion was the personality, attitude and ability of individual interns.

4. The concept of service was perhaps basically the major cause of frustration. Because of their idealistic orientation, many interns expected to effect more change than was actually possible.

5. From the learning perspective, however, the vast majority of the interns expressed the feeling that they had in fact "learned" from the experience.

The employment supervisors also had varying opinions concerning the program and the interns. The majority were complimentary and expressed a sincere desire to continue the project. Others, however, felt that the intern's performance was merely average and not what they expected. There is no doubt that in a few cases the interns were unproductive, the supervisors apathetic and the job meaningless to all involved. The majority, however, were pleased and satisfied, relating in many instances that some programs could not have operated without the interns.

Each intern wrote a report on his experience, and it is interesting to note that some supervisors' opinions have changed upon reading the intern's final report. Some felt the interns were overly critical and did not recognize their contributions.

The summer program can be considered a success, especially when viewed as an initial effort in a very complicated arena. Much was learned that can be of use in the future development of the Urban Corps.

Many of these ideas were incorporated into the Urban Corps operation during the academic year 1969-70. The fall internship program began September 29, 1969. It consisted of 55 interns, in 18 private agencies and 10 city departments. All the interns except six were CWSP-supported. Eleven colleges participated. These internships ran twelve weeks until December 19. Plans for 1970 are under way including a long-range organizational structure for the Urban Corps outside of city government.

Programs of Atlanta Colleges

Seven interns surveyed nine Atlanta area colleges and universities during the summer and fall of 1969 to identify existing programs providing students with service experiences in community social and economic programs. The nine institutions were: Agnes Scott College, Emory University, Oglethorpe College, Georgia Institute of Technology, Georgia State University, Atlanta University, Clark College, Morehouse College, and Spelman College.

The survey was made by telephone and personal interviews with administrative officers, including deans and heads of departments, with faculty and with students. The following questions served as guidelines:

1. To what extent does existing curriculum require students to participate in community activities? (Example: student teaching, internships as pre-requisites to certain degrees, research or community problems.)

2. Are there any volunteer projects through which students may become involved in dealing with community problems? If so, who sponsors these programs?

3. Are students involved in tutorial projects, voter education, voter registration drives, consumer education programs, etc.?

4. How many students are involved in the college or university work-study program? How are these students being used?

5. Are there any links between institutions of higher education and private businesses, civic associations or other groups (e.g., the Urban League, churches, American Civil Liberties Union) which provide opportunities for student involvement in community affairs?

6. Do student organizations sponsor programs requiring community involvement? (Investigate all available student organizations, student government, fraternities, sororities, Young Democrats, etc.)

7. To what extent do students participate in the Atlanta Urban Corps Program?

8. To what extent are faculty members involved in community affairs through voluntary activities, research, consulting, etc.?

Each intern presented his survey as a report. The information on the whole is uneven, quite extensive for some institutions and meager for others. This fact is attributed in part to the lack of information, in part to the nonexistence of programs, and in part to the differences in the zeal and follow-up of the individual intern. Some covered the ground quite completely

while others did not.

Outlined below are programs and activities reported by interns from their surveys. Activities are divided into groupings indicating the college involved. The number of students or the proportion of the student body involved in most instances could not be learned, as such records are not usually kept.

I. Traditional Credit Programs Involving Off-Campus Experiences

A. Agnes Scott College

1. Psychology Department - Observation of children off-campus

2. Sociology Department - Some field study in three courses

3. Education - Practice teaching

B. Atlanta University

1. Education - Practice teaching

2. Social Work - Field work with indigent groups and with community agencies, cancer campaign, etc.

C. Clark College

1. Medical Technology - One year of clinical work in an approved hospital

2. Education - Practice teaching

D. Emory University

1. Dental School - Clinics for dental patients with low income level

2. Education - Practice teaching, tutoring, reading clinic

3. Library Science - Ghetto, hospital and school library service

4. Medicine - (Department of Community Health) Students make home visits, work in Emory Family Planning Center and at the Southside Comprehensive Health Center.

5. Nursing - Clinical experience in some 20 health facilities

6. Psychology - Educational Psychology doctoral candidates must do inservice training in community hospitals and agencies.

7. Sociology - Graduate students must work in supervised treatment and rehabilitation in hospitals, prisons, etc.

E. Georgia Institute of Technology

1. Architecture - Students design for Model Cities, redevelopment areas, etc., parks and playgrounds.

2. Social Science - Students teach Basic Adult Education, work in Bedford Pine Community.

F. Georgia State University

1. Anthropology - Credit to students who live with Indians, poor whites and blacks, as field study requirement

2. Political Science - Research for state legislature done by students

3. Music - Practice teaching

4. Psychology - Requires year internship in hospital or clinic

5. Speech - Students investigate speech disorders among school children.

6. Medical Technology - Seniors must do clinical work in hospitals, as do occupational therapy students.

7. Education - Practice teaching

G. Oglethorpe College

1. Education - Practice teaching

2. Sociology - Three hours a week for ten weeks in some social work activity, such as Linwood Community, Fulton County Department of Family and Children Services

3. Criminology - Students serve as "volunteer" probation officers.

H. Spelman College

1. Home Economics - Provides for study under supervision with selected pre-schools

2. Education - Practice teaching

3. Physical Education - Students required to work in schools, community centers and with agencies

4. Psychology - Majors are required to participate in clinical research studies conducted in homes, hospitals, agencies, etc.

II. Curricular Innovative Credit Programs

A. Emory University

1. Law - 30 hours in legal aid for inmates (U.S. Penitentiary in Atlanta) or Emory Community Legal Services

2. Nursing - Summer interns in hospital in foreign country (5 in summer 1969)

3. Political Science - Internships in state legislature

4. Educational Psychology - Graduate students employed at Parent-Child Center

5. Theology - Freshmen must devote one quarter to pastoral care at such places as Grady Hospital, Georgia Clinic, etc.

B. Georgia Tech

1. Sociology - Majors analyzed behavior and interaction to be considered in developing new housing in Gainesville, Georgia

C. Georgia State University

1. School of Urban Life - Inter-disciplinary programs focused on urban problems

D. Oglethorpe College

1. Metropolitan Studies - Graduate program includes urban problem research and independent study; urbanology course for undergraduates

III. Curricular Voluntary Non-Credit Programs

A. Agnes Scott

1. One senior art student correlated her research with observations of elementary art being taught.

B. Clark College

1. Involvement in Atlanta College Theater Association - A seven-college theatre group gave presentations in community.

C. Emory University

1. Law - Summer institute in Community Legal Services (10-12 Law interns) no credit but stipends

2. Nursing - Students work in hospitals and agencies in summer for experience and money.

3. Political Science - Field data gatherers

4. Sociology - Undergraduates work summers in agencies (such as Fulton County Health Department, OEO Metro Planning Commission) through connections in Department.

5. Emory Research Center for Social Changes - Some 150 students employed as field workers and research assistants.

D. Georgia Tech

1. Sociology - Students registered voters in slum areas.

E. Georgia State

1. School of Urban Life - Tutoring, working in Vine City, work in public finance, land development, Model Cities program, etc.

F. Spelman

1. Sociology - Students encouraged to work in community activities

IV. Student Organization or Student-Sponsored Participation - Voluntary

A. Agnes Scott

1. Counselors for Girl Scouts

2. Tutors for school children

3. Teaching campus employees to read (20 students involved)

B. Atlanta University

1. Social Work - Some students work in community

C. Clark College

1. Student Government - Tutorial projects for children and adults; recreation program for neighboring community

2. Delta Sigma Theta Sorority - Work in local girl's club, teaching "Black Heritage" class, field trips for underprivileged children, dramatics class for children, visiting individuals at both Old Age and Children's Home

3. Alpha Phi Alpha - "Big Brothers" of Atlanta and tutorial program

4. Students are paid for work in voter registration drives, poll watching, etc.

D. Emory University

1. Medical students operate the Plunkett Town Project, including tutorial, recreation supervision, transportation assistance, a small clinic (80-100 students involved).

2. Nursing students do volunteer work in Vine City and other poverty areas.

3. Student Center Board Community Services keeps a listing of projects not officially sponsored by Emory; 1969 (spring) involved over 150 students in projects in Bedford Pine, Summerville-Mechanicsville Tutorial, Fulton Mills Tutorial.

4. Students assist in other projects, such as Emmaus House, CRISIS, Quaker House, etc.

5. Theology students developed a Community Action Committee to assist with worthy causes.

E. Georgia Tech

1. Student government - development of Atlanta Urban Corps through its leadership

2. Techwood Tutorial Project (20 students)

3. PAL Programs for eight 18 year olds from families with no male head of household (6 students)

4. Hi-Step tutoring program for potential drop-outs at O'Keefe High School (30 students)

5. 80 Tech students constructed a playground in Vine City.

6. Interfraternity Council issued a publication on need of 29 Atlanta agencies hoping to solicit action by its members.

7. The Council also trained "drug teams" to hold symposia at local high schools explaining dangers of drugs.

F. Georgia State

1. Psychology - Students work in hospitals or with agencies as volunteers or for pay.

G. Morehouse

1. College Community Relations Enterprises - Tutoring 300 children, supplying information regarding legal, educational, welfare and employment in community

2. 30 students work in Urban League

3. Students work in Upward Bound program.

4. Student Government organizes recreation and music programs to attract the community.

H. Oglethorpe

1. Fraternities - Work in Linwood Community, participation in Empty Stocking Fund, work at orphanages, etc.

I. Spelman

1. Student Government - Community Action Committee requires each club, class and dormitory to sponsor a community project for a year, (examples: recreational and educational programs for Carrie Steele Pitts orphanage, Vine City project to aid residents, tutoring programs).

2. Voter registration and voter education (students paid)

3. Atlanta College Theater Association work

4. Work with Friendship Baptist Church on community projects

V. Work-Study Jobs Off Campus

A. Atlanta University - None off campus

B. Clark College

1. About one-third of Clark's students are in work-study programs, but only 18 are working off campus in such jobs as: tutoring, FAIT, Atlanta Urban Corps, director art workshop, administrative trainee, Atlanta University Center

C. Georgia Tech

1. Summer of 1969, 20 students worked off campus - Nature of work not given

D. Georgia State

1. Of 27 students enrolled in the work-study program, two work with FAIT, five with the Urban Corps.

E. Morehouse

1. About 135 students in work-study programs - 12 of these are off campus in recreation, Atlanta Urban Corps, etc.

F. Spelman

1. About one-third of the students in work-study program - ten of these work off campus in programs such as: Rent-A-Kid, Community Council, City of Atlanta Comptroller General, Cancer Society, Urban Corps, YMCA.

General Observations and Comments

In addition to the activities outlined above, the interns reported several programs in the planning stage. A Community Services Task Force is planned at Georgia Tech to aid residents of "central city" who are affected by expansion of the campus. Emory Law School students are planning a seminar on urban problems. Less activity is seen in the liberal arts colleges.

Considerably more interest on the part of individual faculty and students is reported than is accommodated by existing or planned activities. However, the trend seems to be toward greater community involvement rather than a withdrawing behind academic walls. Students see many possibilities. They suggest relationships between history and art students and local museums. Spanish students could tutor Cuban refugees in Atlanta. Psychology and sociology students could work with related agencies or do individual projects. The Emory four-day week of classes allows one full day per week which could be used for service-learning projects.

With the exception of the Georgia Institute of Technology where the Assistant Dean of Students is the Coordinator of Community Services, there is no single place on any one of the nine campuses where a student or an agency interested in community service involving students can go for information. There is a lack of communication between institutions and even between departments in the same institution in regard to off-campus interests or opportunities. Each program tends to be isolated from others to that no one knows what is going on or, more important, what could be developed to serve both

educational and community needs.

Students did not see the college placement offices or College Work-Study Program offices as being sources of information or assistance. Until the development of the Atlanta Urban Corps, no off-campus work-study assignments were arranged in Atlanta with the colleges surveyed. Financial aid offices and placement offices seem to interpret their roles narrowly, often reflecting their status in the institution. They play essentially no role in educational policy or planning and very little in community service.

Although a number of imaginative and productive programs are seen, the low level of activity relative to community needs, to student interest and to educational potential is the more outstanding observation of this study. Stated in a positive way there appears to be a great deal of opportunity for combining student interest and educational development with community service needs as indicated by a variety of isolated, small current programs.

Community Employment of Students

To extend the scope of the student manpower project beyond the experience of the Atlanta Urban Corps and area college programs, a sampling of regular student employment situations was explored by two interns. One intern interviewed 30 employers ranging from major private businesses to local public agencies. The other intern sampled student employment by federal agencies in the Atlanta area. Information was obtained by personal visits, telephone calls and questionnaires.

A. Private Business and Other Non-Federal Employers

Each of the 30 employers was visited, and it was found that only 20 of them use or plan to use college students as employees. These 20 employers are:

Local Public Agencies	Private Business & Organizations
Public Library	Georgia Power Company
Water Works	General Motors, Inc.
Children & Youth Council	First National Bank
Police Department	Rich's, Inc. (department store)
Mayor's Office	Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Company
Parks & Recreation Department	Sears Roebuck & Company
Probation Department	Atlanta Newspapers, Inc.
Prison Department	The Coca-Cola Company
City Planning Department	Davison's, Inc. (department store)
DeKalb County Merit System	Atlanta Civil Liberties Union

In order to determine the employer's attitudes toward student employees, 30 pre-arranged interview questions were asked. The major categories of interest were: 1) demographic data, 2) reasons for hiring students, 3) opinions on advantages and disadvantages of student employment, 4) relationship of jobs to student training and capability, 5) ratings of student performance, 6) relationships with educational institutions.

The total employment of the 13 largest and most responsive employers was 23,818. These same agencies employed 2,496 students in the summer of 1968 and 2,873 in the summer of 1969. Thus in summer 1969, students represented 8 percent of the total employment in these organizations. All but 163 students were employed on full-time temporary basis. Sixty-two percent of 1969 summer student employees were male. Thirty-six percent of the student employees were black.

The majority of employers agreed on reasons for hiring students. Eighty-five percent ranked "to do the job" first among reasons. Seventy-five percent ranked "for future permanent employment" second. Eighty percent ranked "to give them real work experience" as third in order of priority and 75 percent ranked "helping students earn money" as fourth. Tied for fifth

place were "personal acquaintance" and "participation in co-op programs."

Choosing from a scale of excellent, good, average and poor, 10 percent of the employers rated students' performance "excellent" and the remainder chose "good."

Questions about participation in an internship program which caused concern on the part of major private employers were related to job descriptions which are well defined by the employer, hours of work which are similarly fixed, pay scales related to union agreements, and other technical problems. Non-business employers reported satisfaction with an internship program relationship, and all those who had participated in such a program indicated they would consider it in the future. Almost all employers (98 percent) answered "no" when asked, "Are there ways of altering present student employment patterns to engage more students?" This was inconsistent with the experience of the Atlanta Urban Corps.

Dealings with colleges consisted almost entirely of listing vacancies with placement offices. Fifty percent of the employers felt that they would benefit from greater linkages with colleges.

In general the most favorable responses to greater and more educationally relevant use of students came from public agencies, and the least flexible responses came from private business. The intern suggests that both private and public employers could do much more in encouraging the educational advancement of all employees--not just temporary college student employees.

A parallel survey of student employees of the 13 employers noted above was conducted by the same intern. Interviews were conducted while students were at work and a substantial number (60) responded although a reluctance to interrupt work schedules hampered the survey somewhat. Six were freshmen, ten were sophomores, 12 were juniors, 30 were seniors and two were graduate students. Thirty-eight were black and 22 were white.

The approximate annual income of the parents of the greatest number of these students (26 percent) was $5,000 to $7,000. Twenty percent reported parents' income between $10,000 and $13,000 and 19 percent reported parents' income of over $15,000. Among all students, 62 percent reported the main reason for working was to earn money, with 25 percent agreeing that the second most important reason was to gain experience. Five percent said they took their jobs to better their understanding of people and four percent wanted to do something relevant.

Fifty-one percent of the students felt that their salaries were sufficient and 49 percent felt they were too low for the work performed. Yet all students reported a very satisfactory relationship with their employers (77 percent) or an average relationship (23 percent). Thirty-two percent reported their jobs allowed little or no initiative, and the remainder indicated that some freedom to use initiative was possible.

Fifteen percent reported their previous academic training to be highly relevant, and 15 percent reported no relevance at all. The remainder reported a slight or moderate relationship between former academic work and job.

The educational value of job assignments was rated from "none" to "average" by the great majority, with only 15 percent reporting high educational value. Academic credit was reported in only two percent of those surveyed, and most students felt that their jobs were not educationally valuable enough to merit credit.

The low relevance of previous education to jobs and the even lower educational content of jobs is seen by the intern as an indication that far more potential is represented than is realized: "If jobs could supply both monetary reward and academic training, a new dimension might be added to both education and work. Most students take jobs for money but would like to learn something or gain meaningful experience as well." Few opportunities to receive both money and meaning are apparent from this survey.

B. Federal Employers

The intern assigned to the federal survey had difficulty getting responses, partly because of the problem of identifying an appropriate person in the agency, partly because of lack of information in agencies, and chiefly because of insufficient guidance and the interns' lack of experience. However, information was collected from the following agencies with the help of the regional office of the U. S. Civil Service Commission.

Food and Drug Administration (FDA)
General Services Administration (GSA)
Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers
Department of the Army, Fort Stewart
Veterans Administration (VA)
Department of Labor (DOL)

Total employment represented by these agencies was 6,163; 274 students were employed during the summer of 1969. This was about 10 percent less than the 298 employed in the summer of 1968. Of the students surveyed, 35 percent were males and 65 percent were black.

All employers preferred full-time temporary employment to part-time work. GSA and the Corps of Engineers reported participation in co-op programs.

All but the Department of Labor reported the primary reason for employment of students was to get a job done, with future employment or work experience as second in importance, paralleling the non-federal survey. The Department of Labor rated "to help students earn money" as most important, reflecting special emphasis on assistance to the disadvantaged. Personal acquaintance, appropriately, ranked last, with participation in co-op programs next to last.

The percentage of student employees utilizing their academic training and capability estimated by these employers ranged from "no answer" from two agencies to 30 percent from the VA, to a high of 90 percent at DOL, again reflecting individual target groups. On the average, it was estimated that 20 percent were underutilized and 10 percent were stretched beyond previous training and experience. All but one which did not report indicated that student employee performance was good or very good, with none reporting average or poor performance.

The type of jobs that students performed were generally office jobs of a clerical nature. The reasons given for this were the short-term availability of students and limitations of higher skilled jobs. Manpower ceilings were cited as a problem along with budgets.

Very little educational dimension was seen, and relations with colleges seemed limited to placement offices with the exception of the co-op programs mentioned above.

In summary, the federal agencies reporting were very much interested in students but utilized relatively few, most of whom were women in clerical or office roles. They offered little encouragement for greater or more professional involvement of students because of manpower ceilings and budgets. The sampling of agencies was small and revealed widely different policies and practices, indicating that a more detailed and comprehensive study might be needed to get a true picture of the present and potential utilization of students by federal agencies in Atlanta.

Student Manpower Survey

The manpower survey questionnaire (Appendix A) was prepared on the basis of the objectives of the project, recommendations from student interns, and experience with previous surveys conducted among SREB interns. It was pre-tested among some 50 Atlanta college students in March, 1969. It was then revised and administered between April 10 and June 10, 1969.

Time and money did not permit the administration of a highly sophisticated instrument to all students nor to use a scientifically predetermined random sample. Nonetheless, 1,670 students from Agnes Scott College, Clark College, Emory University, Georgia State University, Georgia Institute of Technology, Morris Brown College, Oglethorpe College, and Spelman College responded to the survey.

Several internal checks were made, and it was ascertained that all but an insignificant handful of students gave consistent answers. The evidence is that the survey results speak honestly for the 1,670 respondents; however, inferences about the student population in Atlanta are matters of opinion and judgment rather than statistical projections of probability.

A variety of techniques was used to obtain answers from a broad spectrum of the student body. At Agnes Scott, the questionnaire was placed in every fifth mailbox and collected within 24 hours. At Clark, some of the questionnaires appear to be invalid, but they do not constitute a significant proportion of the total responses nor is there evidence of a systematic distortion among the questionnaires completed. At Emory, half the questionnaires were distributed to graduate students and half to undergraduates in the dormitories. At Georgia State, the surveyor took the questionnaires to classes having various types and ages of students. At Georgia Tech, two students stationed themselves near the post office and asked every fourth person to complete the questionnaire.

At Morris Brown, the surveyor stationed himself in the Union Building and asked students to complete the questionnaire, seeking to obtain a representative sample by class and sex. At Oglethorpe, the surveyors placed themselves in booths in the recreation center and administration building and attempted to obtain a representative group of respondents by sex, class and residence. At Spelman, the survey was conducted among students in certain required courses, such as English.

The number of completed questionnaires from each college and respective enrollments for autumn 1968 are given in the chart below:

Colleges	No. of Returns	Fall of 1968 Enrollment
Agnes Scott	136	739
Clark	100	1,003
Emory	261	4,945
Georgia State	466	10,454
Georgia Tech	402	7,951
Morris Brown	81	1,372
Oglethorpe	150	1,100
Spelman	72	945
Total	1,668	28,509

Enrollment at other Atlanta area institutions of higher education in autumn 1968 is given in the next chart:

Colleges	Fall 1968 Enrollment
Atlanta Christian College	196
Atlanta School of Art	147
Atlanta University	1,056
Columbia Theological School	211
DeKalb Community College	3,827
Kennesaw Junior College	1,278
Morehouse College	1,035
Interdenominational Theological Center	113
Total	7,863
Grand Total	36,372*

*The 36,372 college and university students represent a significant resource for the Atlanta area. When combined with 20,470 students at the University of Georgia in Athens and 3,344 students at West Georgia College in Carrollton, both of which are well represented in Atlanta intern programs, the total number of students is 60,176, or nearly one percent of the nation's 7,000,000 students in higher education.

Completed questionnaires were submitted to Georgia State University, and data were compiled by the university's computer through the courtesy of the university and the cooperation of the Urban Life Center and the Department of Political Science.

All the information in Tables 1-6 is in percentages, and in most instances the percentages have been rounded. Because of this procedure, some columns total more than 100 percent, while others may total slightly less than 100 percent.

A. Sample Characterists

Institutional Characteristics. As the data in Table 1 show, over two-thirds of the respondents are enrolled in three institutions--Emory University, 15.6 percent; Georgia State University, 27.9 percent; and Georgia Tech, 24.1 percent. Respondents in predominantly black institutions represent 15.3 percent (Clark College, 6.1 percent, Morris Brown, 4.9 percent, and Spelman College, 4.3 percent).

Class Standing. In terms of class standing, 92 percent of the students are undergraduates, with the freshman, sophomore, junior and senior proportions of the sample being almost equal in representation. This is somewhat distorted since some law students apparently considered themselves as freshmen rather than graduate students.

Age, Sex, Marital Status, and Residence. Eighty-one percent of the students are under 22, and only 5.1 percent are 23 or older. The 19 and 20 year old categories include almost half of the sample (47.5 percent). In marital status, 83 percent are single. The male-female composition of the sample is 55 percent male and 45 percent female. In regard to place of residence, 47 percent reside in metro Atlanta, 19 percent live in Georgia outside of Atlanta, and 35 percent list their permanent place of residence as out-of-state.

Family Income. As the responses show, college students in Atlanta come predominantly from middle-income and upper-income groups. Only 15 percent of the students report family incomes of $6,000 or less, whereas 65 percent report family incomes of $10,000 or more. The importance of family income as a correlate of college enrollment is well illustrated in responses to Question 51 which show that 50 percent of the students identify parents as the primary source of income while they attend school. However, it should be noted that over 40 percent rely upon employment, scholarships, grants, or student loans as primary sources of income. This latter finding clearly suggests that in spite of parental affluence, about one-half of the students must find some means of supplementing family resources to finance their education, although 89 percent report either no dependents or claim "self" only as a dependent.

VISTA-Peace Corps Experiences. Only 9 percent of the students reported previous experience in such programs as VISTA, the Peace Corps or other volunteer efforts.

TABLE 1

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

Sex	
Male	55%
Female	45%

Class Standing	
Freshman	24.0%
Sophomore	24.5%
Junior	22.7%
Senior	20.9%
Graduate	5.6%
Special	.3%
Other	2.0%

Age	
18 and Under	15.8%
19	25.3%
20	22.2%
21	18.2%
22	13.4%
23 and Older	5.1%

Marital Status	
Single	83%
Married	16%

Place of Residence	
Metro Atlanta	47%
Georgia, Outside Atlanta	19%
Out-of-State	35%

Parents' Income	
Under $ 4,000	5%
$ 4,000 - $ 6,000	10%
$ 6,000 - $10,000	21%
$10,000 - $19,000	38%
$20,000 or above	27%

College or University	
Agnes Scott	8.1%
Clark College	6.1%
Emory	15.6%
Georgia State	27.9%
Georgia Tech	24.1%
Morris Brown	4.9%
Oglethorpe	9.0%
Spelman	4.3%

Respondents Number of Dependents	
0	67%
1	22%
2	6%
3	5%

B. Part-time Work and Volunteer Service

A total of 881 students stated that they had spent some time during the 1968-69 school year in paid employment or volunteer service. As Table 2 reveals, most of this work was performed off campus (70 percent), and 51 percent reported that they spent 15 hours or more per week in their assignments. What was the nature of the work performed? Responses to Question 15 reveal that white collar assignments (sales work, clerical or secretarial, and administrative or professional work) were held by 53 percent of the respondents. Furthermore, responses to Question 17 show conclusively that private business and institutions of higher education are the prime beneficiaries of student manpower. Over one-half (51 percent) reported assignments in private business and almost one-fourth (23 percent) worked for colleges or universities. Only 12 percent worked for government agencies.

What motivated students to seek work experience? Responses to Question 16 show that economic gain (i.e., "to earn money") emerged as the principal motivator for student employment. Seventy-two percent listed "to earn money" as the primary reason for taking a job assignment while only 5 percent worked for the purpose of helping people in need. It is also significant that 70 percent of those who held work assignments during the school year received salaries of $1.61 per hour or better but only 12 percent worked for no compensation. (See Q. 18)

Did the student work assignments require the use of previous education and training? Twenty percent answered "not at all" to this question; 50 percent responded "a little" or "some," and 30 percent felt that substantial amounts of previous education and training were transferable to their work assignments. Yet, in spite of a reasonably high correlation between educational experience and work, 76 percent reported no relationship between their regular academic programs and work assignments, and only 3 percent expected to receive academic credit as a reward for their work.

TABLE 2

PART-TIME WORK AND VOLUNTEER SERVICE

Q. 12. Where did you perform the service or employment?

On Campus	20%
Off Campus	70%
Both on and off Campus	10%

Q. 13. On the average, how much time did you spend on it (per week)?

Up to 5 hours	14%
5 - 10 hours	14%
10 - 15 hours	21%
15 - 30 hours	32%
Over 30 hours	19%

Q. 14. To what extent was your previous education and training utilized?

Not at all	20%
A little	22%
Some	28%
Substantially	19%
Fully	7%
Over 100%	4%

Q. 15. What was its nature?

Counseling or recreation	14%
Farming or construction	3%
Factory work	4%
Sales work	15%
Clerical or secretarial	24%
Administrative or professional	14%
Other	27%

Q. 16. What was the primary reason you took the assignment?

To earn money	72%
To help people in need	5%
To learn something or gain experience	15%
To understand others better	1%
To do something relevant	3%
Other	4%

TABLE 2 (Continued)

Q. 17. For whom did you perform this assignment?

College or university	23%
Church	3%
Municipal agency	2%
County agency	2%
State agency	3%
Federal agency	5%
Private business or industry	51%
Private, non-profit organization	6%
Other	6%

Q. 18. What was your rate of compensation?

None (i.e. volunteer service)	12%
Less than $1.00 per hour	2%
$1.00 - $1.60 per hour	17%
$1.61 - $2.00 per hour	29%
$2.01 - $3.00 per hour	27%
$3.01 - $4.00 per hour	8%
Over $4.00 per hour	6%

Q. 19. What is the most significant relationship between your assignment and your regular academic program?

None	76%
Academic credit awarded or expected	3%
Part of course requirement	5%
Subject of class discussion	5%
Subject of discussion with professor	3%
Other	8%

C. Summer 1968

A total of 1,150 students reported that they were primarily engaged in working, performing volunteer service, or working and attending school during the summer of 1968. Fifty percent performed these tasks in the metro Atlanta area, 15 percent worked in Georgia outside Atlanta, and the remaining 35 percent worked out-of-state. The statistical descriptions of these 1968 summer assignments are reported in Table 3, and this data may be summarized as follows:

1. Seventy-six percent of the students spent 35 hours or more per week working (primarily in white collar positions); private industry employed 64 percent of these students; and 75 percent of the students received $1.61 per hour or better.

2. Only 3 percent were engaged in volunteer services carrying no compensation for services performed.

3. Again, economic motivation to earn money emerged as the motivating force for 76 percent of the respondents.

4. The utilization of previous education and training closely parallels that described above in responses to Question 14.

5. Summer employment appears to bear even less relationship to academic programs than work assignments carried out during the regular academic year. Indeed, 85 percent of those working during the summer reported no relationship between their work and their academic programs, and only one percent expected to receive academic credit for their work experience.

TABLE 3

STUDENT WORK SUMMARY FOR SUMMER, 1968

Q. 20. What were you primarily engaged in last summer?

Working	59%
Performing volunteer service	1%
Work, attending school	11%
Attending school	15%
Traveling	8%
Attending military camp	2%
Other	4%

Q. 21. Where did you perform the service or employment?

Metro Atlanta	50%
Georgia, outside Atlanta	15%
Out-of-state	35%

Q. 23. To what extent was your previous education and training utilized?

Not at all	23%
A little	19%
Some	29%
Substantially	20%
Fully	5%
Over 100%	4%

Q. 24. What was its nature?

Counseling or recreation	11%
Farming or construction	7%
Factory work	10%
Sales work	13%
Clerical or secretarial	22%
Administrative, professional	13%
Other	24%

Q. 25. What was the primary reason you took it?

To earn money	76%
To help people in need	2%
To learn something, gain experience	16%
To understand others better	1%
To do something relevant	2%
Other	3%

TABLE 3 (Continued)

Q. 26. For whom did you perform it?

College	5%
Church	1%
Municipal agency	3%
County agency	3%
State agency	6%
Federal agency	8%
Private business or industry	64%
Private, non-profit organization	1%
Other	5%

Q. 27. What was your (hourly) rate of compensation?

None - Volunteer	3%
Less than $1.00	3%
$1.00 - $1.60	19%
$1.61 - $2.00	34%
$2.01 - $3.00	28%
$3.01 - $4.00	8%
Over $4.00	5%

Q. 28. What was the most significant relationship between your service/employment and your regular academic program?

None	85%
Academic credit	1%
Course requirement	2%
Discussion with professor	4%
Other	8%

D. Student Plans for Summer, 1969

As Table 4 reveals, the vast majority of students had made plans to work during the summer months of 1969. Fifty percent planned to work while not attending school; 23 percent planned to combine school attendance and work. By May of 1969, 59 percent already had "a definite job lined up" and 63 percent felt that they "must make" over $501 during the summer months. Again, it is significant that only one percent intended to become involved in volunteer work.

In spite of summer commitments, students were asked to respond to a series of questions combining various features of the service-learning concept to determine the conditions under which they would be most interested in seeking assignments in programs related to urban development. Responses to questions 32 - 38 reveal the following:

1. Service-learning internships in the fields of education, recreation, and legal services are of greatest interest to college students; 63 percent of respondents chose one of these three areas as the field in which they would most prefer to serve.

2. Internships providing academic credit and stipends equal to what students feel they must make during the summer months are acceptable to 82 percent of the respondents.

3. However, when the responses to questions 34 and 36 are compared, it becomes readily apparent that it is money, not academic credit, which is most influential in student responses.

The importance of the financial factor also was reasserted when students were asked about off-campus internship programs during the 1969-70 academic year. (See Table 5) Although 47 percent of the students considered work or service assignments to be either a necessity or a possibility often requiring over 10 hours per week of their time, they responded more favorably to economic incentives than to academic credit rewards. When asked "Would you be interested in working or serving off campus if you received about 3 hours per semester of academic credit, but no payment?", 39 percent said "Yes." However, 49 percent were willing to work off campus without academic credit if they could receive payment at the rate of $1.60 per hour.

TABLE 4

STUDENT PLANS FOR SUMMER, 1969

Q. 29. Which one of the following activities best describes what you expect to be doing this summer?

Employment	50%
Attend school	15%
Employment and attend school	23%
Travel	4%
Volunteer service	1%
Military	3%
Don't know	3%
Other	2%

Q. 30. If you plan to work, do you have a definite job lined up?

Yes	59%
No	30%
Inapplicable	11%

Q. 31. How much money do you feel you must make this summer?

None	15%
Up to $250	7%
$251 - $500	16%
$501 - $750	18%
$751 - $1000	18%
Over $1000	27%

Q. 49. Which do you find most effective in finding a summer job?

Public employment agency	6%
Private employment agency	4%
School placement office	14%
Contact at home	25%
Contact at school, outside placement office	7%
Want-ads	6%
Previous employment	22%
Don't know	15%

Several hundred internships with urban development agencies are expected to be available in Atlanta for college students this summer. The work assignments will include, among others, health services, recreation, community planning, legal services, basic education, and job development. The duration will be 12 weeks. Each student will have a job supervisor and an academic adviser, attend seminar discussions, and prepare a final report.

TABLE 4 (Continued)

In questions 32 - 38, assume that you presently have no commitments for the summer of 1969; would you probably seek this kind of internship (answer each question "yes" or "no"). . .

Q. 32. If you received no academic credit and had to pay a $100 to $500 fee for the internship?

Yes 5% No 95%

Q. 33. If you received no academic credit and enrolled as a volunteer (no fee, no stipend)?

Yes 21% No 79%

Q. 34. If you received no academic credit and were given a stipend equal to the amount shown in your answer to Question 31?

Yes 68% No 32%

Q. 35. If you received from 3 to 6 hours of academic credit and had to pay a $100 - $500 fee for the internship?

Yes 15% No 85%

Q. 36. If you received from 3 to 6 hours of academic credit and enrolled as a volunteer (no fee, no stipend)?

Yes 40% No 60%

Q. 37. If you received from 3 to 6 hours of academic credit and also received a stipend equal to the amount shown in your answer to Question 31?

Yes 82% No 18%

Q. 38. If you would seek an internship under at least one of the above conditions, in which field would you most prefer to serve?

Education	29%
Health	8%
Job development	5%
Manpower training	3%
Recreation	18%
Legal services	16%
Housing and land use	6%
Community organization	8%
Other	6%

TABLE 5

STUDENT PLANS FOR ACADEMIC YEAR, 1969-70

Q. 39. What do you expect will be your availability in academic year 1969-70 for a part-time work or service assignment off campus?

A necessity	15%
A possibility	32%
Very unlikely	29%
Not applicable	12%
Don't know	12%

If you plan to attend a college or university next year, please answer "yes" or "no" to Questions 40 - 43. Would you be interested in working or serving off-campus . . .

Q. 40. If you received neither academic credit nor payment?

Yes 14% No 86%

Q. 41. If you received about 3 hours per semester of academic credit, but no payment?

Yes 39% No 61%

Q. 42. If you received no academic credit but were paid at the rate of $1.60 per hour?

Yes 49% No 51%

Q. 43. If you received about 3 hours per semester of academic credit and were paid at the rate of $1.60 per hour?

Yes 70% No 30%

Q. 44. If you answered "yes" to Question 43 above, how much time would you be prepared to devote to your work or services?

Up to 3 hours per week	8%
3 to 6 hours per week	19%
6 to 10 hours per week	26%
10 to 15 hours per week	29%
Over 15 hours per week	28%

E. An Alternative Curriculum

In recent years, much discussion has focused on the question of whether college curricula are "relevant" to what is occurring in the external environment. Furthermore, many students have articulated demands for a closer integration of formal academic programs with work experience in human services or economic development fields. In attempting to gauge student opinion on the latter point, respondents were told:

> Suppose you could choose to spend one-fourth of your time in college in meaningful work assignments in the human services or economic development fields. You would have a job supervisor and an academic adviser, attend seminar discussions and prepare a final report. Your course requirements would be reduced by one-fourth of the present total. Assume no increase in the cost of your education.

As the data show, about six out of ten students would select this option. Students who favored this option overwhelmingly preferred that assignments be related to their respective fields of study (89 percent), and 67 percent preferred the metro Atlanta area as the geographical location for their assignments. Moreover, when asked what period of assignment they most preferred, 72 percent favored part-time throughout college and full time during summer. Twelve percent selected full time for one quarter each year. (See Table 6)

TABLE 6

AN ALTERNATIVE CURRICULUM FOR STUDENTS

Suppose you could choose to spend one-fourth of your time in college in meaningful work assignments in the human services or economic development fields. You would have a job supervisor and an academic adviser, attend seminar discussions and prepare a final report. Your course requirements would be reduced by one-fourth of the present total. Assume no increase in the cost of your education.

Q. 45. Would you probably select this option?

Yes	56%	No	41%
Only under these conditions	3%		

Q. 46. What kind of assignment would you select?

Related to field of study	89%
Outside field of study	11%

Q. 47. What period of assignment would you prefer?

Part-time throughout college	52%
Full-time during summers	20%
Full-time, one quarter each year	12%
Substitute for freshman year	1%
Substitute for sophomore year	2%
Substitute for junior year	4%
Substitute for senior year	7%
Other	2%

Q. 48. Where would you prefer the assignment be?

In metro Atlanta	67%
Georgia, Outside Atlanta	5%
Elsewhere in U.S.A. - Urban setting	10%
Elsewhere in U.S.A. - Rural setting	3%
Foreign Country	14%

F. Summary Observations

Although there is much talk about volunteer service and a relevant education, the need for money remains the determining factor for most students. For example, during the academic year 1968-69, 72 percent of the students who worked or volunteered their services did so primarily to earn money. And during the summer of 1968, the comparable figure for students surveyed was 75 percent.

Looking ahead to the summer of 1969, 73 percent said they planned to work and only one-half of one percent planned to do voluntary service. Student employment was the primary source of income for 23 percent of those surveyed and the secondary source of income for an additional 36 percent of the students.

In the summer of 1968, the typical Atlanta college student interviewed worked full time in the private sector primarily to earn money. The job required that he make less than full use of his previous education and training, and there was no significant relationship between what he did and his academic program. He earned from $1.50 to $3 per hour and found his job through personal contact, whether at home, school or through previous employment.

In contrast, this student would have preferred in the summer of 1969 to have worked in the public sector in a field such as health, education, recreation, legal services or job development. He would have needed to earn from $1.50 to $3 per hour, and academic credit, though desirable, would not have been essential.

These survey results were buttressed by the experience of the Atlanta Urban Corps. Although applications for the Urban Corps were not invited until after many college students had already lined up their summer jobs, some 1,000 students applied to join the Urban Corps in late spring to work in public sector jobs such as those described above.

During the academic year 1968-69, slightly over half the students in the survey engaged in paid employment or volunteer service. The typical student worked off-campus in the private sector for over 10 hours per week and was paid from $1.50 to $3 per hour. He took the job primarily to earn money; his previous education and training was utilized only slightly, and there was no relationship between his assignment and his regular academic program.

The apparent affluence of survey respondents was somewhat higher than that of college students across the country. The chart below compares family incomes for the students surveyed with those for entering college freshmen in 1968, according to a survey by the American Council on Education.

Family Income	Atlanta	USA
Below $10,000	35%	49%
$10,000 to $20,000	38%	38%
Above $20,000	27%	13%

It is not clear from the facts available whether the Atlanta students' family income is higher than the national average, whether the respondents were above the Atlanta students' average income, or whether the difference was due to a combination of these factors.

Personal contact appears to be a more important factor in finding a job for white students than for black. For the latter, public employment agencies are relatively more helpful while previous employment is effective for both black and white students.

For the sake of comparison, the answers to the question, "Which do you consider most effective in finding a summer job?" are broken down by predominantly black and white colleges.

	Black	White
Public employment agency	22%	3%
Private employment agency	4%	3%
School placement office	10%	15%
Contact at home	6%	29%
Contact at school outside placement office	6%	8%
Want-ads	10%	5%
Previous employment	34%	21%
Don't know	8%	17%

What is the maximum number of students who would be available for community service? Of all students, 81.5 percent would have chosen an urban internship in Atlanta in summer 1969 if they received from three to six hours of academic credit and if the size of the stipend was commensurate with their financial need. Seventy percent of the students said they would be interested in working or serving off campus during the academic year if they received three hours of academic credit and were paid at the rate of $1.60 per hour.

Judging from the survey, the upper limit for the number of students prepared to serve without compensation is about 15 percent. During the school year, the proportion of all students giving volunteer service was about 6.5 percent; during the summer, it was about 2.5 percent. However, their intentions for the future were more generous. Nearly 21 percent said they would probably enroll in a service-learning internship that carried no academic credit and no stipend. Almost 14 percent said they would be interested in volunteering for off-campus service in the coming year, and 15 percent said they did not have to earn any money during the summer.

These figures suggest an upper limit to unpaid service of about 15 percent. This level will not be reached without an efficient system that matches the volunteer with an appropriate job and whose basic mechanics are in good working order.

Hence, under optimal conditions, it is assumed that the participation rate in community service integrated with curriculum would be 75 percent of all students in the summer and 60 percent of all students during the academic year.

But the conditions that now exist are closer to minimal than to optimal. During summer of 1968, 85 percent of the students reported no significant relationship between their assignment and academic program, and only 3 percent said that it was part of a course requirement or that they expected to receive academic credit for it. The record improved during the academic year 1968-69, with 76 percent of the students reporting no relationship and 8 percent saying it was a course requirement or that credit was anticipated. Another 8 percent said it was a subject of discussion with the class or the professor.

If participation in the service curriculum is to increase, a major shift would have to occur among the agencies where students work. Most of the work in the service curriculum would be done with public agencies or private, non-profit organizations. Yet in summer 1968, these agencies engaged only 27 percent of the students in service or employment, and during academic year 1968-69 they engaged only 20 percent of such students. The potential manpower available to them from students is far greater than is being utilized or planned for.

The Atlanta Service-Learning Conference

In the early stages of the student manpower project it was apparent that other organizations, institutions and individuals had interest and experience in student-community programs. A meeting of interested parties confirmed the need for a means of exchanging information and exploring together the implications of service-learning for students, colleges and community organizations. Particular interest was expressed in examining the Atlanta Urban Corps development as a practical laboratory for student involvement in community programs.

A variety of individuals and groups participated in the conference which held its inaugural meeting in June 30 - July 1, 1969 and its concluding meeting on March 6, 1970. Sponsors included:

The City of Atlanta
The Atlanta Urban Corps
Economic Opportunity Atlanta
The Colleges and Universities of Atlanta
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
The Southern Regional Education Board
Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA)
The Peace Corps

The conference has carried out its work of exploring service-learning and information exchange through general conference meetings and work groups devoted to particular facets of the service-learning concept. These work groups and conference sessions were concerned with the topical areas of service, learning, curriculum, finance, research, and methods and programs. The research component consisted primarily of the material collected under the Atlanta Student Manpower Project. This material is included in the conference final report which lists findings and recommendations of the conference. The conference has provided a means of including other organizations and individuals in the collection and analysis of material for the project and a means of immediate dissemination of project information to the agencies most immediately concerned.

Most of the SREB internships outside of the Atlanta Urban Corps experience in 1969 have been individual projects geographically dispersed with only one or no more than a few interns assigned to any one agency. One reason for supporting the Atlanta experiment was to test the internship pattern developed by SREB on a larger scale in an urban setting. In general the hypothesis that large numbers of students could be matched with equal numbers of community projects was supported by the Atlanta Urban Corps experience. The experience confirmed SREB's findings in more isolated situations that there is no lack of tasks that need to be carried out nor is there a lack of interested and capable students.

Because of the large scale of the Atlanta program the degree of college involvement, individual guidance and support and reporting requirements were weaker than in the SREB internships elsewhere. The results, positive and negative, tend to confirm the value of the basic pattern utilized in the SREB internships. This pattern provides for productive release of student manpower potential at levels consistent with student capability and agency needs.

Internship Pattern

Each internship or team project represents an individual program and each varies with the type of student, the choice of topic, the character of host agency and the policies of the university or college participating. Most include full-time assignments of twelve weeks, but part-time internships during college terms are also arranged. Fundamental to all is the concept of service-learning, i.e., the accomplishment of a needed task coupled with a deliberate use of the experience as a basis for educational growth. All internships have certain common ingredients to assure both effective service and effective learning.

1. <u>An organizational base</u>

   Each intern is assigned to an organization carrying out programs related to social and economic development which has the capacity to effectively utilize an intern and to contribute to his learning.

2. <u>A project directed toward a community need</u>

   Each internship begins with the definition of a project by the host organization, with assistance from program staff and a university representative. The project must be needed by the host organization, of sufficient scope and level to assure motivation and growth of the student, feasible in terms of the limitations of time and student experience, and educationally viable.

3. A university or college connection

Universities and colleges normally participate in internship projects in their own geographic areas. They provide assistance in defining purpose, scope and method of the chosen project, assuring educational value. Interns are recruited through participating colleges and begin immediately to share in planning project approach and schedule. Participating schools provide counselors to serve on internship project committees.

4. A project committee

Each internship has a project committee including a minimum of:

a. A host organization official who gives the intern guidance, assists him in gaining access to community resources, relates the intern's project to the overall program of the organization, and aids him in obtaining needed services.

b. A university counselor who is available for advice on procedures and methods and assists in achieving high standards of project execution and report preparation. The counselor's primary function, however, is to interpret with the intern his experience for the intern's educational and personal development.

c. A technical representative, competent in the area of concern, who assists the intern in identifying technical resources and in achieving sound technical content in his work and report.

5. A high degree of intern initiative

Interns are charged with performing a needed task and are given the time, financial support, organizational status, and personnel resources to accomplish the project objectives. They are primarily responsible for their own schedules, approaches and direction, using committee members as resources rather than looking to them for close supervision. This independence is an important feature in student response, growth and achievement.

6. Seminars and consultations

Each intern consults with his academic counselor, relating his experience to theories, models, readings, and other experiences. He also participates in intern-operated seminars stressing the interrelationships between different disciplines, programs and problems. He shares his experiences with others, gaining a broader perspective and seeking common denominators of societal change.

7. A project report

A final report is required of each intern, causing him to organize and articulate his experience, observations, and recommendations. It is written for the host organization and must pass the test of usefulness as well as meeting academic standards. Project reports are normally reproduced in finished form for use by the host organization. In many cases it becomes a first "publication" of the student, and in some cases it is used as part of a graduate thesis or dissertation.

8. Follow-up and evaluation

Interns, counselors, host organization officials, program staff and other project participants review the internships in terms of impact on the community, the student, the educational institution and the program. Continuing relationships between participating colleges and host organizations are encouraged. The use of the student and community contacts as resources for academic courses is also promoted. Interns are assisted in exploring career possibilities in community service, and a number have taken positions with development agencies at state, local and regional levels.

The career patterns of former SREB interns was explored by another intern during the fall of 1969. From a total number of about 350 former interns, 153 responses were received indicating status and location. The results are outlined below:

Status of 153 Former Interns 1966-1968

Student	53
Military Service	16
Housewives	3
Employed	
Public or Community Service	71
Private Business	10
	153

Of the 71 former interns now in public or community service, 27 were in social or economic development programs, 20 were in teaching or research at the college level, 10 were in public school systems and 14 were in other positions in public service with state, local and federal agencies. A number of the former interns were employed by the organizations where they had served their internships.

The Atlanta program has no comparable data yet since it has just completed its initial year. However, if it follows the pattern of SREB internships, it has considerable potential for encouraging public service employment among college graduates.

In summary the student manpower explorations in Atlanta tend to confirm the less concentrated SREB experience and observations elsewhere. It appears, therefore, that the observation, conclusions and recommendations arising from the Atlanta Project would have applicability in both urban and rural settings.

RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS

The examination of student manpower utilization and potential in Atlanta, coupled with other related experiences and observations, suggests a number of implications for manpower, youth and educational policies. First, it is clear that the 7,000,000 college students represent a large source of immediate manpower available to public service agencies. This source of manpower is now poorly utilized, both in terms of potential man-hours and in terms of levels of work, particularly in public agencies.

In addition to the immediate potential of student manpower, this group represents the major source of new professional manpower in the immediate future. The image of public service reported by students, particularly at local and state levels, is very poor. This is due, at least in part, to the absence of positive association of students with public service agencies. On the other hand, many students express the desire to serve social goals and have responded enthusiastically when given opportunities.

Concurrent with availability of students as both an immediate and future source of manpower for public service agencies, is the great unmet need for social services. Quantitative information on public service manpower needs in Atlanta was not possible to obtain. Manpower needs are not the same as "positions open" and the Atlanta experience found no upper limit on the needs. The response to the question "How many students could you use?" was often "We can use as many as you can send us" from supervisors who knew the magnitude of the missions of their agencies and their relative lack of resources.

One estimate of manpower needs in education, health, welfare, public protection, day care, manpower development, public works and other such services that could utilize students was reported as 28,000 to 34,000 in the Atlanta area. This was estimated by applying percentages based on population in Atlanta to national estimates of manpower needs. Another approach, used in exploring potential student assignments in North Carolina, found approximately 20,000 "units" of public service in that state. If each school system, employment service office, local health department, etc. could utilize from one to five students, the potential range would be from 20,000 to 100,000. It is not hard to accept the proposition that each of these "units" has at least five needed tasks that students could perform during any given period of time.

Viewed on the national level, if one-half of the 7,000,000 college students were engaged in assisting public service agencies in carrying out their tasks, a great part of the gap in the delivery of public services could be closed, and social and economic development programs could be substantially

accelerated. Beyond this are the implications for public service careers and citizen leadership, the implications for education, and the implications for youth in relation to society.

As is suggested earlier in this report, the most effective utilization of student manpower is not achieved through traditional employment patterns. A project or task approach rather than a position or function approach is found to be superior in exploiting the creative talents and energy of students and making the most efficient use of their time. Relating the project assignment to the student's educational growth and requiring disciplined interpretation with faculty support yields even greater gains.

Too often the choice open to students seems to be "work for money to pay for education" or "volunteer for service to find meaning outside of education." Must students assume that society will pay for sales clerking but not for social services? If student potential is to be realized, alternatives to these choices are needed on a large scale which combine the student's desire for service, his need for money, the college's need for relevance in education and the manpower needs of public service agencies. To move toward a fuller utilization of the potential of student manpower for community service the following recommendations are made.

1. Public agencies should incorporate the use of students in their manpower planning.

   The regular use of students to assist in carrying out agency programs should become a pattern of operation on a year-round basis. A project or task approach should be used, allowing students to function at a level which utilizes their abilities and provides for deliberate educational growth. Student employment should not be used to avoid the employment of full-time breadwinners but should respond to the particular contributions that students can make.

2. Public agencies should budget for the costs of student manpower.

   Many agencies carry surplus funds in their personnel budgets due to problems of keeping all budgeted positions filled constantly. These funds can be used for student manpower, but more desirable would be an actual budget allocation for student manpower. This would be justified by the contributions of students to needed tasks and the investment in students as future manpower and citizens.

3. Student employment of the service-learning type should be exempted from manpower ceilings.

   Agencies may have tasks and funds but find themselves unable to "employ" students because of manpower ceilings. Students on service-learning assignments should not be seen as filling positions to which manpower ceilings apply. Some agencies have contracted with colleges or other

agencies for student services using contract service or consultant funds. Advantages are seen in treating the student as an independent contractor or as a recipient of an educational stipend on assignment. However it is structured, steps should be taken to remove regular manpower ceilings as a bar to fuller student utilization.

4. Coupled with greater use of student manpower should be an information and promotion program for public service careers.

   Students having public service internships frequently request information on career opportunities in public service. Interest stimulated during student assignments to public agencies should be followed with information on career needs, challenges and specific opportunities.

5. Colleges and universities should coordinate their service programs, placement offices, financial aid offices and educational programs for full exploitation of the learning potential of service assignments.

   On many campuses little relationship is seen between service functions and educational programs. Placement offices and financial aid offices have little or no role in educational matters. As more students become active in community programs this coordination of education, service, community placement and financing will become of utmost importance.

6. College work-study programs should be used to encourage off-campus assignments of the service-learning variety.

   In the past, college work-study program funds have been used primarily to provide financial aid in return for on-campus jobs. The CWSP policy now is to encourage a greater percentage of off-campus assignments. However, unless special efforts are made, the off-campus programs will follow the pattern of most on-campus programs with little concern for what the student does as long as it meets program financial aid criteria and with no concern for educational value. Off-campus financial aid under CWSP is limited to assignments in community service. For public agencies, therefore, this program can be a major resource for effective student manpower release of students in financial need.

7. Research is needed on the learning dimensions of service.

   The use of service assignments as a means of education is accepted in specific academic programs, but not enough is known about learning in the context of service to indicate the most desirable forms and processes to use. Students returning from Peace Corps assignments, internships, or the other experiences in community service often claim they learned more from these than from their formal educational program. When questioned, they are unable to articulate what they learned or what factors contributed to this learning. That learning takes place is not seriously questioned, but more about the nature of the learning and the

factors important to it needs to be known if service assignments are to be coordinated with other facets of education.

8. Agencies for fostering, implementing and servicing student service-learning on a larger scale are needed.

   There are many types of public service agencies and educational institutions. Random relationships between these institutions and agencies do not facilitate effective student participation very efficiently. Needed is a point of coordination and information to which educational institutions, students, and agencies can look for assistance. The Atlanta Urban Corps is developing into such an agency and will be the major instrument for the release of student potential in its area. Similar agencies are being developed with the cooperation of colleges and public agencies in Winston-Salem, North Carolina; New Orleans, Louisiana; Savannah, Georgia; the State of South Carolina, and with other local and state areas throughout the South and nation. This development should be encouraged and supported by national policies and programs.

9. Federal agencies' policies and programs should be designed and applied to encourage the use and development of student manpower potential.

   National policy should allow and encourage federal agencies to include students in their manpower planning and budgets.

   Federal agencies concerned with education, manpower and community services should provide support for the training and assistance needed to develop and implement student service-learning programs. Support is needed for the development and growth of agencies such as the Atlanta Urban Corps. Assistance is needed to train personnel in public agencies in the effective development and structure of student assignments. Research and experimentation support is needed to assist colleges in exploring the structure and use of service assignments for learning and the integration of such assignments into academic curricula and calendars.

10. A National Youth Service Foundation or some similar manifestation of a national youth policy is needed to foster, encourage and support programs of large-scale, productive involvement of students in community service.

    VISTA and the Peace Corps, the major national programs for youth involvement excluding military service, includes only a fraction of a percent of college age youth. Rather than suggesting a single federal program, it is recommended that federal leadership and support is needed to develop programs at state, regional and local levels that will include large numbers of students, public agencies and colleges throughout the country. In this way, the process can become institutionalized in public agencies and colleges to the benefit of both.

A P P E N D I C E S

A. STUDENT MANPOWER SURVEY FORM

B. PROJECT STAFF AND INTERNS

B I B L I O G R A P H Y O F R E L A T E D M A T E R I A L

APPENDIX B.

Project Staff

William R. Ramsay, Project Director
Donald Eberly, Staff Consultant
Margaret Ruth Smith, Staff Consultant
Tim Ryles, Georgia State University, Survey Coordinator

Project Interns

Thomas Affleck
Emory University

C. Lytton Coarsey
Georgia Institute of Technology

William F. Gee
Morris Brown College

Douglas Haire
Georgia State University

Catherine Hynes
Georgia State University

Barbara Kalvelage
Georgia State University

Joseph Menez
Oglethorpe College

Marlene Rounds
Atlanta University

Martha Simmons
Clark College

Doris Sims
Spelman College

Teia Sinkfield
Spelman College

Francis Stewart, Jr.
Georgia State University

Tara Swartsel
Agnes Scott College

Gail Zauderer
Agnes Scott College

Ukang'a C. Mudakha
Atlanta University

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RELATED MATERIAL

1. Atlanta Service Learning Conference, Report 1970.

2. Atlanta Urban Corps, An Approach: Summer 1969.

3. Southern Regional Education Board Resource Development Project

   Unpublished intern reports, 1969:

   (a) Affleck, Thomas III, "Off-Campus Activities at Emory University."
   (b) Coarsey, C. Lytton, "Off-Campus Activities at Georgia Tech."
   (c) Haire, Douglas, "Urban Corps Attitudinal Study."
   (d) Hynes, Catherine A., "Off-Campus Activities at Georgia State University."
   (e) Menez, Joseph R., "Off-Campus Activities at Oglethorpe College."
   (f) Mudakha, Ukang'a C., "Off-Campus Activities at Atlanta University and Morehouse College."
   (g) Rounds, Marlene, "Student Manpower Utilization: Federal Agencies."
   (h) Stewart, Francis, Jr., "Student Manpower Utilization: Non-Federal Agencies."
   (i) Swartsel, Tara, "Off-Campus Activities at Agnes Scott College."
   (j) Zauderer, Gail, "Student Manpower Survey."

   Published intern report, 1969-70:

   Mettler, Alexandra, "Service-Learning Models"

4. Southern Regional Education Board Resource Development Project, Annual Report 1967, 1968.

5. Southern Regional Education Board Resource Development Project, Progress Report 1969.